

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 22 and 24-25 are presently active in this case. Claim 22 amended and Claim 23 canceled by way of the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action Claims 4 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werkhoven et al. (U.S. Pub. 2001/0041250) in view of Mogami et al. (U.S. Patent 6,459,126); Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werkhoven in view of Mogami and further in view of Jackson (U.S. Pub. 2003/0146310); Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Werkhoven in view of Mogami and further in view of Raaijmakers (U.S. Patent 6,511,539); Claim 22 was objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base Claim 21; Claim 24 was objected to as depending from Claim 22 and Claim 25 was allowed.

Applicants first wish to thank Examiner Lee for allowance of Claim 25 and the indication of allowable subject matter in Claims 22 and 24. In order to expedite issuance of a patent in this case, rejected Claims 4, 7, 21 and 23 have been canceled. In addition, Claim 22 has been amended in independent form including the limitation of the base Claim 21. Therefore, all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Steven P. Weihrouch
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 32,829

Edwin D. Garlepp
Registration No. 45,330

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

I:\ATTY\EDG\267410US-AM-DUE-12-27-07.DOC